



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

BEVERLY EAVES PERDUE
GOVERNOR

EUGENE A. CONTI, JR.
SECRETARY

January 29, 2009

MEMO TO: Don Lee, Berry Jenkins, Michael Taylor, Jay Bennett, Ron Hancock, Judith Corley-Lay, Stuart Bourne, Randy Garriss, Jonathan Bivens, Dennis Wofford, Ed Spencer, Brian Webb, Michael Manning, Gerard Pilcher, Jim Seybert, Ben Lanier

FROM: R. A. Garriss, PE
Contract Officer

The subject committee met on Thursday, December 18, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. in the Riverwood Conference Room at the Century Center with the following in attendance:

Jay Bennett	Michael Manning	Ed Spencer
Jonathan Bivens	Clark Morrison	Michael Taylor
Barney Blackburn	Gerhard Pilcher	Brian Webb
Randy Garriss	Jim Seybert	Dennis Wofford
Ron Hancock	Ted Sherrod	Roger Worthington
Berry Jenkins	Norma Smith	

The following items were discussed:

Randy discussed the list of delayed and withdrawn projects. The January 2009 withdrawn listing is available on the Project Services Website:

<http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/ps/contracts/letting.html>

1. AC AND FUEL PRICE ADJUSTMENTS SPECIAL PROVISIONS

Randy explained that these provisions will direct the contractor to the Construction Unit website for the most accurate AC and Fuel Prices. There will be a link from the Project Services Website also. The Industry suggested a slight change in the wording for clarity.

2. DTM FILES DURING THE BID PROCESS

The Industry asked if the Department could provide DTM files in "dgn" or "xml" format instead of "tin" format. Jay Bennett replied that the Department could provide the plans in "xml". However, after discussion, it was decided that Berry Jenkins would send an e-mail

MAILING ADDRESS:
NC DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CONTRACT STANDARDS AND DEVELOPMENT UNIT
1591 MAIL SERVICE CENTER
RALEIGH NC 27699-1591

TELEPHONE: 919-250-4128
FAX: 919-250-4119
WEBSITE: WWW.NCDOT.ORG

LOCATION:
CENTURY CENTER COMPLEX
ENTRANCE B-2
1020 BIRCH RIDGE DRIVE
RALEIGH NC

to his members for feedback on their preference of format. He will bring the results to the next meeting.

3. UTILITY PAY ITEMS AND QUANTITIES

The Industry and Department discussed the variables of boring "in soil" and "not in soil", including different pay items. The Department agreed to put pay limits length on the plans. Roger Worthington will also investigate and offer suggestions.

The Industry said they had a couple of jobs where the plans did not designate whether to use PVC or Ductile Iron waterline pipe. The line item just stated a certain size waterline. The Department replied when the contractor has a choice of material, this is how waterline is shown since the 2006 Specifications rewrite. However, there have been cases where a particular type of pipe is required and this was not clearly shown on the plans. Roger Worthington has addressed this with his engineers to ensure the plans are more consistent.

The Industry also wanted to follow-up on possibly adding a few items back to the utility section for payment. They asked if the Department got comments from any other contractors. The Department has not received any comments or examples to review other than the one example from a subcontractor on a PO contract.

4. LUMP SUM GRADING

The Industry said a large project (Craven/Jones) had unclassified excavation lump sum payment and a very small project had 800 yards broken out as a pay item. The Department replied based on the criteria for lump sum, if any one item is greater than 50% of the total, it is pulled out of the LS Grading item and paid for on a unit price basis. However, the divisions still have the ability to request that the project be Lump Sum depending on individual circumstances. The pay item works 80% of the time. The Department is evaluating anomalies and will continue to monitor the quantities and question when the criteria is not followed.

5. EROSION CONTROL QUANTITIES

The Industry asked to be updated on changes in calculation methods for items such as Stone for Erosion Control Class A and Filter Fabric for Drainage. These items appear to be over-estimated on recently on several projects.

Barney Blackburn said the Department's calculations are shown in a spreadsheet on the Erosion Control Standards Microstation Workspace. He also said that the Department is using more Class A stone and filter fabric and also using more Class A stone for Type B inlet protections. The Department is using filter fabric in specialized devices, like skimmer basins and applying a maintenance factor as well.

Jay Bennett said the Department is using smaller concurrent or side-by-side basins, and there will be more quantities shown on the newer designs.

Ted Sherrod added that the Department is tracking overruns; the top three for 2007 were matting, mowing and safety fence. Silt Excavation and Class A stone did not fall into either overrun or underrun category. The Industry replied that this has just shown up the past 3-4 months. It is too early to tell if it will affect the subs also.

Update on Erosion Control Items by Ted Sherrod: DOT is extending the certification dates for Level II candidates, most are expiring in 2008. The Department is providing a 12 month grace period until 12-31-09. It will be posted on the certification website, and would like to notify the contracting industry through the AGC website. The same has occurred for the Level I certification; and it has been registered and noted on the certification website. Changes to the reclamation plan will go into effect in January 2009. They will be posted on the Project Letting website. Pit dewatering will be a new Specification, effective in January 2009 also. Both provisions have been reviewed by this subcommittee.

6. **SIGN SPECIFICATION**

The Industry asked for an update of any changes to the sign specification; specifically mounting the sign to the support being incidental to the structure if the structure is new.

The Department said there is an overhead sign assembly provision that goes in the contracts. Sign erection, walkway, maintenance walkway and sign are all incidental to overhead sign assembly. However sign erection on an existing overhead sign where drilled holes, new hardware, attachments, traffic control, crane, etc. to install a sign is a separate pay item. On proposed overhead sign assembly where it comes in pieces, it is expected that everything is assembled on the ground before it is erected on the foundation. The Industry said in the signing plans, the quantities for overhead sign assembly and sign erection of an existing sign are the same, leading one to believe that the payment would be the same for sign assembly, and sign erection, including both pay items on overhead sign assembly, even though the Specifications say it is an included item. It is confusing when the Specifications say one thing and the plans show the same quantities. Plans should not show quantities for sign erection on new overhead sign assemblies. The Department agreed.

7. **NEW PIPE SPECIFICATION**

The Industry has a concern with the new pipe specification requiring suitable local material or select material for foundation conditioning between the pipe and stone. This works good in most conditions, however, they are concerned what will happen in a wet situation with water running in the hole that is being dug, and water will be running after the pipe is backfilled. Will the sand stay in place under the pipe or wash away? The Department will look at wrapping the stone. The Industry suggested laying the fabric over the stone instead of wrapping the stone. The Department is working on a draft Specification that will be given to this subcommittee for review.

8. **ELECTRONIC SUBMITTALS** – Berry Jenkins said that AGC-DOT Structures Committee discussed how well electronic submittals have worked for Structures. They suggested expanding the electronic submittals to other areas. Examples are signals, signs, lighting

plans, RS-1, drainage, plan revisions and reclamation plans. The Industry asked if there is a listing of submittals. There is a listing in the *Construction Manual*. The Industry would also like to have a *consistent tracking system* for the electronic submittals. Structures currently uses Microsoft Access to track their submittals. Berry asked the Industry to send in their suggestions to him before to the next meeting.

9. **OTHER BUSINESS**

Cost Savings on Projects – The Industry commented that they are aware that the Department is looking for cost-savings on all projects. The Inspectors and Residents cannot always determine if there are incorrect designs, overruns, or quantities that are not correct. They feel that the Inspectors and Residents are reluctant to add to overruns; even when needed because they are afraid it will affect their performance evaluations or pay raises. The Department is being extremely cautious of doing any work that is not needed; however it is recognized that overruns will happen and should be documented. The Department asked for specifics so that the right information can be filtered down to the Residents and Inspectors.

Twelve Month Warranty Inspections – The Industry asked to be notified prior to the 12-month warranty inspections. In some situations, the contractor cannot find areas described by the Department. The Department agreed this is a good idea and suggested that this request be made with each Division Construction Engineer at the time of project acceptance.

DBE Commitments at Time of Bid – One contractor asked the following: When bidding several large projects in a letting, adding each line item for DBE commitments is an arduous process. Why can we not add a dollar volume of commitment and deal with the individual items after the bid? The Department will investigate and give an answer at the next meeting.

2009 Meeting Dates

February 19 April 23 June 11 August 20 October 22 December 17

Cc: Victor Barbour, PE
Ellis Powell, PE
Norma Smith